

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed January 19, 2005 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-52 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. New claims 53-94 have been added which particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these claims may be found in the specification, page 17, lines 4-13. While these claims have not yet been examined, the prior art rejections of claims 1-52 will be discussed herein so as to differentiate the new claims from the prior art.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

**The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 21-26, 29-33, 36-40, 42, 50 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Beser<sup>1</sup>.

Claim 53 contains the element "inserting said proxy address into a server identifier field in said response". The response was defined earlier in the claim as being received from an address allocation device. Beser fails to teach this element.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Patent 6,189,102

In Beser, the response packets (DHCPoffer message) do not have their server identifier fields modified. The proxy in Beser receives the DHCPoffer message from a DHCP server and makes a determination about where to forward it based on information in the message (including examining a BROADCAST bit). However, there is nothing in Beser to suggest modification of the DHCPoffer message by the proxy - it simply forwards it on to the appropriate CM. See Beser, col. 18, line 49 through col. 19, line 16.

This is not a trivial difference. As stated in the specification, page 17, of the present invention, "by changing the giaddr and siaddr fields to the DHCP proxy address, this ensures that if the DHCP packet is a packet other than a Discovery or Offer packet, the DHCP packets will continue to be forwarded to the DHCP proxy." In other words, the invention in Beser may work for the passing of the initial DHCPDISCOVER message through the DHCP proxy, but any subsequent DHCP messages generated by the client, such as a DHCPREQUEST packet, will be sent directly to the DHCP server. The present invention allows these subsequent packets to be sent to the DHCP proxy, increasing the ability of the system to monitor and modify the DHCP processes. As such, claim 53 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 60, 67, 74, 81, and 88, these claims contain elements similar to that of claim 53 and thus are also in condition for allowance.

As to dependent claims 54-59, 61-66, 68-73, 75-80, 82-87, and 89-93 the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 3/17/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc S. Hanish  
Reg. No. 42,626

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040